

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
:
CARLTON KNOWLES, *on behalf of himself and all* :
others similarly situated, :
:

Plaintiff, :

-v- :

CLAVEL CORPORATION, :

Defendant. :

24 Civ. 9820 (JPC)

ORDER

-----X
JOHN P. CRONAN, United States District Judge:

The Court has reviewed counsels’ responses to the Court’s April 22, 2025 order to show cause. Dkts. 21, 22. The Court, in its discretion, declines to impose sanctions for counsels’ failure to comply with the Court’s Order of April 14, 2025. But the parties are admonished that failing to comply with the Court’s future orders, including any further disregard of the Court’s deadlines in this matter,¹ may result in the imposition of sanctions. The Court has now twice cautioned counsel about the need to comport themselves with professionalism in this matter, *see* Dkt. 16, and counsel should not expect further leniency.

The Court will separately enter the parties’ proposed Civil Case Management Plan, Dkt. 20.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 1, 2025
New York, New York



JOHN P. CRONAN
United States District Judge

¹ As the Supreme Court allegorized in *United States v. Locke*, 471 U.S. 84 (1985), “[i]f 1-day late filings are acceptable, 10-day late filings might be equally acceptable, and so on in a cascade of exceptions that would engulf the rule erected by the filing deadline [I]f the concept of a filing deadline is to have any content, the deadline must be enforced.” *Id.* at 101. Therefore, the attorneys here are reminded that “[a] filing deadline cannot be complied with, substantially or otherwise, by filing late—even by one day.” *Id.*